

REMARKS

The following remarks are offered in complete response to the Office Action dated July 2, 2008. In light of these remarks and the foregoing amendments, reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 and 16-31 are present in this application. Claims 13-15 have been cancelled in this amendment. Claims 16-31 have been added.

Claims 1-12 have been amended to delete language reciting preferred embodiments. Claim 1 has also been amended to delete the description of the four types of silicone material and to recite the elements in proper process format. Claim 10 has also been amended to be in independent form.

Newly added claim 16 depends from Claim 1 and recites material which was previously recited in using preferably language. Newly added claim 17 is analogous to claim 2 and recites material which was previously recited using preferably language. Newly added claims 18 and 19 are analogous to claim 3 and recites material which was previously recited using preferably language. Newly added claim 20 recites material which was previously recited in claim 4 using preferably language. Newly added claim 21 recites material which was previously recited in claim 5 using preferably language. Newly added claim 22 recites material which was previously recited in claim 6 using preferably language. Newly added claims 23 and 24 recite material which was previously recited in claim 7 using preferably language. Newly added claims 25 and 26 recite material which was previously recited in claim 8 using preferably language. Newly added claims 27 and 28 recite material which was previously recited in claim 9 using preferably language. Newly added claims

29 - 31 recite material which was previously recited in claim 11 using preferably language. No new matter has been added in making these amendments.

The Office Action of July 2, 2008 was a restriction requirement that required the election from among three different types of silicone materials. The amended claims do not recite specific types of silicone materials. In a telephonic interview with the Examiner, it was agreed that these amended claims could be submitted for review and that a restriction requirement may issue as a result of further review.

Applicants note that the International Search Report (a copy of which is attached) for corresponding international application PCT/FR 03/03815, also published as WO2004063265, did not indicate that a lack of unity of invention exists. The MPEP (Section 1850 II.) states:

From the preceding paragraphs it is clear that the decision with respect to unity of invention rests with the International Searching Authority or the International Preliminary Examining Authority.

It is clear from the International Search Report that a lack of unity of invention was not found. Therefore applicants believe that unity of invention exists and that a restriction neither required nor proper in this matter.

If there are any questions concerning this Response or the application in general, Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 29, 2008

By: _____

Gary D. Mangels

Gary D. Mangels, Ph.D.
Registration No. 55424

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620